

## DRAFT

### HCCC Aquatic Rehabilitation Program

#### STORMWATER AND LAND USE WORKGROUP MEETING

March 31, 2010, 1:30 – 3:30 PM

17791 Fjord Drive, NE, Suite 130, Poulsbo, WA

#### ATTENDANCE

Alison Chamberlin, Mason County Public Works  
Amy Georgeson, Mason County Public Health  
Bob Hager, Lower Hood Canal Watershed Coalition  
Dan Hannafious, Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group  
Dave Garland, Dept. of Ecology  
Dave Herrera, Skokomish Tribe  
Neil Harrington, Jefferson County  
Kim McKee, Dept. of Ecology, SW Region  
Phil Wiatrak, Dept. of Ecology  
Richard Gersib, Dept. of Transportation  
Scott Brewer and Robin Lawlis, Hood Canal Coordinating Council

This is the fourth meeting of the workgroup. The following documents were distributed:

- March 11, 2010 meeting notes and current meeting agenda
- Conceptual diagram showing the relationship of the work of this group with the Hood Canal Integrated Watershed Management Plan (IWMP) developed by Ecology staff
- Conceptual diagram modified developed by HCCC staff
- A Vision for Hood Canal IWMP Summary Outline (v. 3/30/10)
- WA State Dept. of Ecology 303(d) list spreadsheet for marine waters in Hood Canal
- Context of the workgroup product(s) within the overall integrated plan approach
- Comparison of stormwater programs, measures and best practices matrices for Kitsap, Jefferson and Mason Counties
- WSDOT Current Tools and Action inventory and assessment description
- WSDOT Programmed Planned Projects spreadsheet
- WSDOT Municipal Stormwater Permit-- Geographic Coverage Areas map (2/4/09)

Chris May, Kitsap County Public Works, was unable to attend but sent an e-mail to members stating his opinion that they not focus too narrowly on the low DO issue as related to stormwater since it presents a much larger set of problems than this one WQ-related issue and his suggestion that it would be better to say stormwater is a broader problem and use the data we have to demonstrate that and work to correct /prevent the array of problems it contributes to. He believes that emphasizing adoption of the most current stormwater standards, advocating retrofitting funding, and pushing hard for the use of LID throughout the HC watershed will be the most effective stormwater management tools we can recommend.

Scott opened the meeting with a brief discussion of the framework of work group products within the context of overall IWMP, which is the comprehensive plan to meet the Hood Canal Coordinating Council's future condition goal through which ecosystem processes, functions and structures are protected and restored while at the same time providing a high quality of life for a sustainable level of future population growth. The desired future conditions include maintaining human health, human wellbeing, species and

## DRAFT

food web, habitats, water quality, and water quantity. A key portion of the Integrated Plan will be the recommended, comprehensive priority actions which should be considered to achieve and maintain the HCCC's "Future Condition Goals". The Hood Canal Low Dissolved Oxygen Action Plan outlines actions to improve the dissolved oxygen regime in the canal as supported by the recommendations of four separate ad-hoc workgroups convened to provide plan input in four topical areas: 1) Wastewater, 2) Habitat; 3) Stormwater and land Use Practices; and 4) Communications. This may be a stand-alone document or a specific section within the Integrated Plan. The Hood Canal Stormwater and Land Use Practices Action Plan outlines the tools and actions needed to improve the quality and/or limit the quantity of stormwater inputs to Hood Canal. Actions can address but are not limited to: 1) capital improvements; 2) infrastructure needs; 3) regulatory and local stormwater program needs; and 4) land use decision processes. This Action Plan will contribute directly to both the Low Dissolved Oxygen Action Plan as well as the "comprehensive priority actions" section of the Integrated Watershed Management Plan.

Kim McKee and Phil Wiatrak discussed the outline and 303(d) list for Hood Canal and Ecology policies on this issue(s) and distributed a conceptual diagram of the IWMP and provided a brief context of where we are going and how they interact and relate to each other. The Hood Canal 303(d) listings can be accessed on Ecology's website (Water Quality Program/Water Quality Assessment (303(d) and by using a simple query tool based upon selecting the Hood Canal Action Area. The group reviewed the Water Quality Program policy on 303(d) listings (<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/303d/wqp01-11-ch1Final2006.pdf>).

Dick Gersib reviewed information regarding WSDOT assignment discussed at the last meeting, which provides an inventory and assessment of the current tools and actions being implemented by the land use authorities and regulatory agencies throughout the Hood Canal watershed.

Discussion of the venn diagram shows the key elements and the relationship of the individual subcommittees. Looking at the diagram with bubbles, Ecology approach is also looking at how everything fits together, how stormwater and wastewater can affect WQ for example, to show the main linkages of the workgroups and how it leads to the IWMP. There are many overlaps, but this is how we can see how to fit the pieces to use as a launch point from any part of the bubble to support the main plan.

Bob Hager sent a diagram beginning from the watershed management plan and components of salmon recovery, aquatic rehabilitation (AR), socio-economic, resource plans, and many more such as WRIA plans. Then there is a focus on AR to show what comes out of that, each box would have extensions with overlaps of other plans and programs. This group focus is highlighted. Stormwater and Land Use Practices show different aspects, all pollutants, shoreline/uplands, solid waste, and surface/water streams; this is echoed with what Chris May was stating in his e-mail, that this is beyond LDO, which is another discussion.

What has to happen to address delisting is a plan that shows how we're going to do that (should it be a standalone plan or is it integrated, or is a separate chapter?), many questions to ask and answer. The action plan should have elements from each of the three groups to aim for, i.e., LDO, input from all three that are actions that would go into the total plan; it is a combination of everything under AR going into a specific plan, which is the right way to think about it. This is a way to address what came up at the last meeting and does it help--what else we want to think about on this. When we think of an IWMP, in relation to an action plan to delist, we see a development as one recommendation to be presented in the IWMP, but we don't see the development of the action plan itself to delist as part of the plan, but a recommendation to prepare that plan and delist as a recommendation, because an action plan should look at previous action plans, it's a standalone document, an IWMP is a different animal, focus is derailed if we're trying to do an action plan

## DRAFT

within the IWMP—it's a standalone piece (development, implementation, etc.), the goal to delist is one recommendation of many that come forward from an IWMP. This makes good sense and the group agreed.

Regarding the box, Action Plans to address impaired waterbody delisting, we shouldn't develop action plans within the IWMP—that is a key recommendation, part of regulations tool box, TMDL's we are required to do under permitting and is a key objective to address 303d listed waterbody, take steps necessary to delist, we changed this box to conceptual. The goal of planning is to come up with recommendations for decision-makers—we have to get to that point. We collect from various works in progress as part of a recommendation to move forward. Part of what work groups should consider is to segregate certain actions that need to be included in delisting action plan, flushed out and pulled together by a separate work group, or a joint work group from all three areas working on it.

Kim said in last meeting there were several comments on delisting, so he prepared a spreadsheet showing current marine impairments for HC, it is on webpage using query tool on Hood Canal 303d listing ([apps.ecy.wa.gov](http://apps.ecy.wa.gov)), he used Hood Canal reference to pull out all of the listing for WRIA 13-17 and then by assessment categorized (1, 2 and 5), in particular category 5 waters are impairments that indicate polluted water. Ecology will not do a TMDL on everyone as a TMDL is not the only way to correct impairments. The important thing is that all 303(d) list improvements are based on data. Data gets impairments listed, data gets impairment de-listed. Any de-listing data must show that standards are being met. He included listing policy link (64 pages), but it will walk you through the rationale for what's on and taking off list, just having a plan doesn't take you off the list, development, implementation actions, and collecting data to meet standards takes you off the list. Having the plan does not delist it, having data showing the state that water quality standards are being met, can. To see how is it established on the website, look at listing policy to show basis for delisting. Whenever the DO concentration goes below the 7 you are not meeting the standard regardless of what the source is. It's not one single sample; there is a certain time period and certain number of samples.

Ecology is changing the schedule for conducting the WQ assessment and 303(d) listing process—rather than assessing all waters every two years, it is moving to assessments of marine and fresh waters in alternating two year cycles. The first split list will be an assessment of all marine water data received by Oct. 15, 2009. The assessment will result in submittal of the 2010 candidate 303(d) list for marine waters to the EPA. It doesn't matter if it's human or natural related—this is a good deal of what goes on in studying impairments so we can act on them to influence. Total listings category 5 Polluted Waters is about 50, mostly DO and fecal coliform, but you have some pH as well. There are a couple of DO parameter listing for south Hood Canal but that's only one segment of marine water. The WQ assessment using the internet mapping tool shows four grids. Places without red (on the map) aren't necessarily unpolluted; they could be waters of concern (category 2) with some evidence of a problem, but not enough to meet listing criteria. No indication could also mean there was no measurement. In the TMDL world we assume an impairment is an indication of a larger problem outside the segment; info is based on where we have data (updated 2008). We could ask Jan Newton if she provided information in the call for marine water data. Integrated multiple samples may be handled differently; we should invite someone who does the assessment work to participate by providing that information, how the list is crafted. It is data that got something listed and it is data that gets something delisted. That link to the 64-page policy will help. In theory, it is possible that we may never be able to delist. A large part is natural causes so it may be difficult to influence. Category 1 waters show there are measurements and standards to meet them. Another objective could be to increase the green grids (on the map). A green area shows it's clean in one area (fecal) but it may not be for another if it wasn't tested (DO or temperature). The group navigated different areas on the map to get a better understanding of the

## DRAFT

reporting system. The bright green means the parameter is covered under a TMDL (category 4A). An effective management report shows we aren't there yet. This is a valuable tool to graph the listings.

When Ecology does the call for data, it helps to show data that could be more current, which reflects a different characteristic; everyone should share with Ecology what they have to paint a different picture--the accuracy depends on data from everyone. Hopefully, all the HCDOP did go into the assessment; we could do that so the benefits will be a more accurate. How does this criterion compare to what EPA told us that the human portion can exceed 0.2 ppm? How do they measure? Although EPA approves the standards, they aren't sure how it is done exactly, but the reliability is 0.2 or less where you can see a measurable change.

The Herrera Environmental Consultants document for WRIA 16 provided an overview of work accomplished so how much can that be formally included into this data set, or can we provide an overlay that reflects all of that work, ie. Skokomish Tribe extensive monitoring? It would be good to have this shown, a visual that captures all of that work. A meeting tomorrow will explain that, a spreadsheet showing who has done what level of WQ monitoring, that data will be available in the Environmental Monitoring System (EIM). Mason Co. has all of that data available. Skokomish feels confident in their quality of data. It is a valuable resource with the caveat that there is varying quality and volume, but a better comprehensive look at what we're dealing with. Part of looking at data that goes into the EIM--we need to look at protocols to ensure data is high enough to make management decisions. One challenge is that the 303d list is older where we may not have that same sense of confidence of quality controls with it. Joy Michaud, Water Quality Principal at Herrera, has an understanding of quality assurance; it is an area of focus to make sure data can be used. Let's check with Skokomish Natural Resources office to make sure their data was included. Allison will look into that but it does seem to be included already.

Review of revised (as of 3/31/2010) stormwater and land use practices outline (matrices). Scott said this is a work in progress and that we need to figure out who will address what with so much to fill in still. Do we want comments on content at this point in time or wait until the writing team finishes. Yes, we need to know if we have the outline components correct before they start. Everyone should make revisions and e-mail to Scott to work on the next revision with the Dept of Ecology. Put content in context with discussions, how much is LDO, what are the other groups doing. There may be more current tools and actions other than just the Union River, etc. The title says Hood Canal LDO, is this only LDO or is it everything? It is everything, so the title should be changed based on the diagram. Chris May's suggestion to incorporate LDO into the broader scope is a good point (source control and regulatory framework).

When we talk about Priority Stormwater and Land Use Issues (page 4 v. 3-31-10 on practices, sources, and pollutants impacting the Hood Canal) that paragraph reads as a broad recommendation but some are not happy with that section because the paragraph to discuss issues was to outline, remedies should go into recommendations, factually represent rather than a broad generalization. The paragraph was just an indication, not what should go in that section. We want this input from members and current tools and actions--the work the counties are doing--should also be included. We need to make a reference to all of the existing plans and actions in the Hood Canal. Rework goals and objectives based on today's discussion. LDO is one of many other issues. We need that language to get to the next level of the draft to keep the process moving.

Our current tools is key, what is working now and what we are already doing should be a focus. Teri King collected this type of data and we should look at what is relevant. Teri was going to do a catalog of current

## DRAFT

activities related to the Partnership agenda. We could use it to cut and paste and not rewrite. Phil Wiatrak will contact Teri for that information. We don't want to duplicate efforts with limited resources.

Many different groups are on the same track with part of the work in common. Dan Hannafious asked Mason County about volunteers as a stand-alone effort rather than part of a larger effort, with funding, but since some of this work has already been done and the IWMP of the HCCC and plans by WRIA 16 and 14, the goal should be that we collaborate and inform each other about all of this work to create a unified effort to include work of key players--maybe not just for the counties, but these groups working on the plan for review and involvement. We do not represent the whole, not everyone is on board for this major effort. Dan is talking to different groups to mobilize folks to collect info we need to make it all work is the right direction. This is exactly the goal of the HCCC Board of Directors; the challenge is to include everyone. This group is one piece which is part of a TAC and a part of the community. Always want to communicate to ensure an inclusive effort and so we don't duplicate the work, yet we have more work to bring others to the table. People decide for themselves what and when they can be involved; it isn't for lack of invitation. Parties who want to be involved should make themselves known. It's not too late for others to participate now and we are glad to extend an invitation. We need to know what the end result or goal is for this plan so we can know who should be involved.

The critical need, high priority, is for the inventory to be completed so we can know if we are reinventing the wheel. There are other groups that want to help with IWMP such as the Nature Conservancy. Let's look at who can do it within a short timeframe with what funding we have now. If we can make it our objective to determine all the groups and documents and clarify goals and objectives, we can produce a good plan that is worthy. The catalog from Teri King has not yet been provided, a general inventory that people provided at the last meeting (Sue Texeira showed us the HWS on the HCC website for salmon and habitat). There is work going on regarding inventory (the HWS), which is being extended into more programmatic action, our website already shows a list of 150 documents related to Hood Canal. After the inventory is complete, then we need an assessment, what the documents are telling us, and then look at gaps to do an analysis. All of this needs to be on a fast track. This is indeed a major concern. One option is to stop the workgroups and focus on inventory and then regroup and revisit where we want to go. As we mentioned, it is a work in progress, we don't have all the resources we need to hammer that, there is not someone dedicated 100% to this effort. Our intent was to include all of the groups, the catalog that Teri is doing, and WRIA stormwater plans. A lot of us at the table now are already involved in those other groups doing work at the Hood Canal.

The Partnership tried to do an inventory, and many involved were disappointed that their information wasn't assembled into a usable format, so a catalog of activity can't hang us up on the detail, the right people are included in this group to skim the cream, what are we doing now is known, with extra info from Teri and the Partnership to fill in. Our concern is that this group is hung up on nuance and details which is clogging up the process so that we can't move forward. The IMWP summary outline comes close to the ability to establish what is as far as plans and programs, No. 3 is an inventory (what's in place, capacity, budget), then there are targets, a gap analysis to see what's missing, then what needs to be done to bridge that gap--those three steps are integral. This could be produced as a usable document where everyone has a role and responsibility to make it happen, but when you are done you have a set of comprehensive recommendations to show where we need to go from multiple advantage points, the outline does this and it's a great way to proceed. Go to [www.hccc.wa.gov/integration](http://www.hccc.wa.gov/integration) plan, then view supporting documents with summary and scope of work, targets, inventory, public involvement strategy and vision statement, and potential indicators (list of everything out there to avoid duplication of efforts, shellfish beach closures, building permits, etc.)—this is not yet complete.

## DRAFT

It would be helpful to meet in person on complex issues with everyone together physically in the future, one longer meeting where we all attend (The Mason County Public Works Department has a large facility in Shelton). Everyone should submit their edits/comments of the outline, goals, objectives and problem statement to Scott. Phase 1 is to develop a draft outline, goals and objectives, an inventory to get focused, etc., and then a workshop where we can address a broader audience for feedback and involvement, which would encourage more participation for discussion (one document with all feedback to Scott who will compile and distribute to the group). We can earmark areas that warrant full discussion before the large group meeting. Phil will take the lead on inventory and contact Teri for Partnership info, defined projects or programs in place for discussion. Scott will bring the website info. The matrix is an inventory for stormwater measures, the ratings are not important at this point in time, so please finish that for discussion as well.

Use [www.doodle.com](http://www.doodle.com) to schedule the next (in person, longer meeting) at the end of April. An outline is due to Scott in two weeks with inventory info before then. Then let Phil know if there are any gaps to get us started (there will be time later to add and delete). This may also include members from the other works groups, such as Dan Hannafious and Duane Fagergren who are also following the IWMP. Please provide alternates for those who cannot attend.